



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	ro.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/752,120	-	12/29/2000	Julio Estrada	L0T9-2000-0021 US1	8738	
27085	7590	03/24/2005		EXAMINER		
IBM CO	RPORAT	ION	VU, KIEU D			
	OFTWAR	<del>_</del>		L DE LOUIE	D + DCD + N / DCD	
ONE ROGERS STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CAMBRI	DGE, MA	02142	·	2173		
				DATE MAILED: 03/24/200	DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

HL			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/752,120	ESTRADA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kieu D Vu	2173	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	ess
Period for Reply	VIC CET TO EVOIDE 2 N	AONTH(S) EDOM	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a y within the statutory minimum of thi will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO to cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed inty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this community. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 S	eptember 2004.		
•	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar			nerits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-25 and 27-32</u> is/are pending in	the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) <u>1-6, 8-25 and 27-32</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	•	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· ·	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			•
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO	-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
<ul> <li>12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:</li> <li>1.☐ Certified copies of the priority document</li> </ul>	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		n received in this National St	age
application from the International Bureau  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	•	t received	
555 the diagnost detailed office determined a list	o. ale columba dopies no		
Attachment(s)	, <b>-</b>	0	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of	Informal Patent Application (PTO-1	52)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)	·	

Art Unit: 2173

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-6, 8-9, 12-16, 23-25, and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salas et al ("Salas", USP 6233600) and Underwood et al ("Underwood", USP 6601057).

Regarding claims 1 and 31, Salas teaches a method for defining theme and associating it with a collaboration space (col 2, lines 19-27) (line 65 of col 1 to line 8 of col 2), said theme including a style sheet and group of layout files (HTML files) (col 2, lines 35-37), with a layout file for each of a plurality of view modes of operation (create mode or edit mode) (col 5, lines 38-53), defining in said style sheet formatting characteristics of skin component of the layout file (locations of name information, thumbnail, text) (col 7, lines 8-36), and upload said theme to said collaboration space (col 12, lines 7-23).

Salas does not teach user definition of by providing which skin components to use and their respective locations. However, this feature is known in the art as taught by Underwood. Underwood teaches a method for creating and updating web site (col 3, lines 55-58), the method comprises a Framework Definer which provides various layout

Art Unit: 2173

variations for a web site (col 5, lines 15-26) and allow user to select and arrange skin components and upload image (col 23, lines 60-67) (col 24, line 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Salas and Underwood before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the theme defining method taught by Salas to include user's selection arrangement for skin components taught by Underwood with the motivation being to enable user to easily modify both content and presentation style of the information of the web document (Underwood, col 4, lines 12-16).

Regarding claim 2, Salas teaches that said collaboration space being a place (eRoom).

Regarding claim 3, Salas teaches that said place being a file directory (col 3, lines 32-33).

Regarding claims 4 and 25, Salas teaches the dragging and dropping said theme from a user desktop to an output control for uploading to a collaboration space server (col 13, lines 14-26).

Regarding claims 5 and 27, Salas teaches the organizing said collaboration space including room (eRoom), folder (col 7, line 19), page (col 3, lines 32-33).

Regarding claims 6 and 28, Salas teaches said user interface components including logo (col 5, lines 54-59), table of contents, action bar 404, tool bar 404, and page content components (col 14, lines 46-50), and said layout files including read mode, edit mode, folder (col 5, lines 38-53).

Regarding claim 15, Salas teaches the providing links to other collaboration space resources (col 2, lines 10-11).

Art Unit: 2173

Regarding claim 8, Salas teaches integrating said collaboration space with an existing web site by including in selective layout files links to network resources (col 2, lines 10-11).

Regarding claims 9 and 24, Salas teaches the uploading said theme to a server (col 13, lines 10-13).

Regarding claims 12, 23, and 32, Salas teaches a method for defining theme and associating it with a collaboration space (col 2, lines 19-27) (line 65 of col 1 to line 8 of col 2), said theme including a style sheet and group of layout files (HTML files) (col 2, lines 35-37), with a layout file for each of a plurality of view modes of operation (create mode or edit mode) (col 5, lines 38-53), defining in said style sheet formatting characteristics of skin component of the layout file (locations of name information, thumbnail, text) (col 7, lines 8-36), and specifying font, size and color style in a common style sheet page (col 7, 37-49), and importing said skin group into said collaboration space (file uploaded; col 12, lines 15-23).

Salas does not teach user definition of by providing which skin components to use and their respective locations. However, this feature is known in the art as taught by Underwood. Underwood teaches a method for creating and updating web site (col 3, lines 55-58), the method comprises a Framework Definer which provides various layout variations for a web site (col 5, lines 15-26) and allow user to select and arrange skin components and upload image (col 23, lines 60-67) (col 24, line 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Salas and Underwood before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the

**Art Unit: 2173** 

theme defining method taught by Salas to include user's selection arrangement for skin components taught by Underwood with the motivation being to enable user to easily modify both content and presentation style of the information of the web document (Underwood, col 4, lines 12-16).

Regarding claim 13, Salas teaches the rendering each said skin individually addressable (Fig. 4; col 2, lines 19-27).

Regarding claim 14, Salas teaches the rendering in said theme said layout file and style sheet pages responsive to collaboration space tags; and responsive to a user request, importing said skin group into a place for instantiating said user interface (col 1, lines 35-45).

Regarding claim 16, Salas teaches the rendering said collaboration space to said user through said user interface (col 10, lines 66-67).

Regarding claim 29, Salas teaches modes (col 8, lines 55-56) and folder (reference numbers 417 and 482).

Regarding claim 30, Salas teaches theme of eRooms (col 7, lines 8-10).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Art Unit: 2173** 

4. Claims 10-11, 17-19, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salas, Underwood, and Van Der Meer ("Van Der Meer", USP 6415316).

Regarding claims 10-11, 17-19, and 21, Salas does not the choosing a theme from a gallery of themes. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Van Der Meer. Van Der Meer teaches a method for implementing a web page diary in which the user can choose a theme, change the theme (col 2, lines 26-29), or edit property of theme (col 10, lines 3-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Salas and Van Der Meer before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface system taught by Salas to include choosing, changing, or editing theme taught by Van Der Meer with the motivation being to give the user the ability to present the theme he or she desires.

Regarding claim 22, Van Der Meer teaches the default and changed themes (col 2, lines 26-29).

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salas, Underwood, Van Der Meer, and Noguchi ("Noguchi", USP 5983184).

Regarding claim 20, Salas does not teach that the interface is structured for communication with a physically challenged user. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Noguchi. Noguchi teaches a method for hypertext control through voice synthesis which enables a visually impaired user to freely and easily control hyper text (col 3, lines 9-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Salas and Noguchi before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface system taught by Salas to include the communication with

Art Unit: 2173

a visually impaired user taught by Noguchi with the motivation being to enable visually handicapped persons to access visual information displayed on the screen.

6. Applicant's arguments filed 09/16/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that "Salas does not teach skin group or theme as a collection of a plurality of layout files and a style sheet", it is noted that Salas teaches the skin group by teaching how components (elements, controls...) of a page will be displayed on a page (col 5, lines 38-67). Salas further teaches theme as a collection of a plurality of layout files and a style sheet (plurality of HTML files....to render HTML pages) (col 2, lines 28-37) (also col 7, lines 37-49).

In response to Applicant's argument that "Salas does teaches components, and does teach HTML, but does not teach the skin group, nor the new collaboration component tags invented by applicants", it is noted that such is not the case.

Salas teaches the skin group by teaching how components (elements, controls...) of a page will be displayed on a page (col 5, lines 38-67). Since web page is rendered by interpreting HTML tags (col 1, lines 35-45), these components should have corresponding tags to indicate to the browser how to display the components.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Page 8

Application/Control Number: 09/752,120

Art Unit: 2173

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kieu D. Vu. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4057.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached at 571-272-4048.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703-872-9306

and / or:

571-273-4057 (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

JOHN CABECA

SPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINATE TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2011

Page 9

Application/Control Number: 09/752,120

Art Unit: 2173

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kieu D. Vu